

EXHIBIT K

EXHIBIT K

1 MARSHALL GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
BRADFORD P. LYERLA (*pro hac vice*)

2 KEVIN D. HOGG (*pro hac vice*)
JEFFREY H. DEAN (*pro hac vice*)

3 GREGORY STANTON (*pro hac vice*)
ANDREW RAYMOND (*pro hac vice*)

4 6300 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
5 (312) 474-6300 (telephone)
(312) 474-0448 (telecopier)

6 blyerla@marshallip.com

khogg@marshallip.com

7 jdean@marshallip.com

gstanton@marshallip.com

8 araymond@marshallip.com

9 COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT CHARTER
COMMUNICATIONS, INC. AND 12 ADDITIONAL
10 CABLE TELEVISION DEFENDANTS

11 ADDITIONAL COUNSEL LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGES

12
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15 SAN JOSE DIVISION

16 ACACIA MEDIA TECHNOLOGIES
17 CORPORATION,

18 Plaintiff,

19 vs.

20 NEW DESTINY INTERNET GROUP, *et al.*,

21 Defendants.
22
23

24 AND ALL RELATED AND/OR
25 CONSOLIDATED CASE ACTIONS
26
27
28

Case No. C 05-01114 JW (HRL)

MDL NO. 1665

**DECLARATION OF
JEFFREY H. DEAN**

1 I, Jeffrey H. Dean, one of the attorneys for defendant Charter Communications,
2 Inc., and 12 other Cable television defendants, hereby state, to the best of my knowledge
3 and belief, as follows:

4 1. Exhibit A to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
5 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" is a true and correct copy of U.S. Pat-
6 ent No. 5,132,992.

7 2. Exhibit B to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
8 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" is a true and correct copy of U.S. Pat-
9 ent No. 5,253,275.

10 3. Exhibit C to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
11 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" is a true and correct copy of U.S. Pat-
12 ent No. 5,550,863.

13 4. Exhibit D to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
14 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" is a true and correct copy of U.S. Pat-
15 ent No. 6,002,720.

16 5. Exhibit E to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
17 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" is a true and correct copy of U.S. Pat-
18 ent No. 6,144,702.

19 6. Exhibit F to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
20 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" is a true and correct copy of the
21 Court's *Markman* order dated July 12, 2004.

22 7. Exhibit G to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
23 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" are true and correct copies of excerpts
24 from the prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,720.

25 8. Exhibit H to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
26 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" is a true and correct copy of U.S. Pat-
27 ent No. 5,195,092 to Wilson.

1 9. Exhibit I to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
2 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" is a true and correct copy of U.S. Pat-
3 ent No. 4,506,387 to Walter.

4 10. Exhibit J to the Memorandum of Law and Fact in Support of Reconsideration of
5 the Court's Construction of the Term "Remote Locations" are true and correct copies of excerpts
6 from the prosecution history of U.S. Patent No. 5,132,992.

7 I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true to the best of my
8 knowledge and belief.

9
10 DATED: July 29, 2005

By: /s/ Jeffrey H. Dean
 Jeffrey H. Dean